

✓
THE

• Dan Smoot Report



DAN SMOOT

Vol. 6, No. 28

(Broadcast 259)

July 11, 1960

Dallas, Texas

FOREIGN POLICY REVIEW—PART II

NATO

By 1949, America's post-war foreign policy had so stimulated communist expansion in Europe that something had to be done. Truman sent General Eisenhower to Europe to set up NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). NATO would be *the* "free world shield against communism."

A few Congressmen and Senators were worried. They said the NATO scheme meant permanent commitment of American soldiers to service in an international army, to defend foreign lands, in times of peace or war. This was too much of a new policy: too radical a departure from our traditional foreign policy of staying out of the affairs of other nations and requiring them to stay out of ours.

Truman and his secretary of State (Dean Acheson) angrily brushed this criticism aside, saying that our troops assigned to NATO were mere token forces to show "good faith" — to prove to our European friends that we were really serious about helping them defend themselves. This token force has become the major part of America's army strength. After 11 years, the only real strength in NATO is American.

NATO is a perennial excuse for American foreign aid to our NATO allies, who never keep their promises to support NATO even after they get our aid. It is also a potential death trap for 300,000 Americans stationed in Germany and France.

In 1949, when NATO was created (with France as the Keystone) we knew that France had

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a magazine edited and published weekly by Dan Smoot, mailing address P.O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas, Telephone TAYlor 4-8683 (Office Address 6441 Gaston Avenue). Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year, \$6.00 for 6 months, \$3.00 for 3 months, \$18.00 for two years. For first class mail \$12.00 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14.00 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for \$1.00; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10.00—each price for bulk mailing to one person.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1960. Second class mail privileges authorized at Dallas, Texas.

been decaying and disintegrating ever since the French Army surrendered to the Germans in 1940. We knew that all vital industries in France were controlled by communist-run unions. We knew that the communist party was one of the strongest in France, often exercising decisive influence in French national elections. We knew that communists occupied key posts throughout the sprawling French bureaucracy — in the military services, in civilian jobs, in the judiciary, in police establishments, and in the government. France has never even made a strong gesture of support for NATO. From the beginning, France has used our military and economic aid to fight rebellions in her colonial empire.

Yet for 11 years we have poured aid into France, because she is the "keystone" of our NATO defenses against communism.

The United States Seventh Army (America's biggest, best-equipped, best-trained) constitutes one fourth of U. S. Army total combat power. With top priority on the newest and best equipment, our Seventh Army is stationed in Germany, deployed along several hundred miles of the iron curtain. Its maintenance costs us above 1 billion, 200 million dollars a year.

The Seventh Army, the 55,000 American troops in France, and the United States Air Force in Western Germany are dependent for their food, fuel, medical supplies, weapons, ammunition, and vital communications on supply lines and bases in France. Our Sixth fleet in the Mediterranean and our Air Forces in England and North Africa have service and supply bases in France.

Without the active support of France as a strong and dependable ally, our air forces in England and Africa and our navy in the middle east would be crippled; and the cream of our fighting army would be left stranded along the iron curtain, facing an enemy that outnumbered it 10 to 1.

In support of *just this one facet* of the foreign policy which Roosevelt announced and which Truman and Eisenhower have followed — we have poured into the NATO scheme almost 300 billion dollars; yet each year, we "cut back" and "stretch

out" or eliminate programs for the defense of America because we cannot afford them.

METO AND SEATO

The Soviets (never recognizing their own puppet states as colonies) have for years propagandized against "colonialism." By this means, communists have wormed their way into the confidence, and control, of political leaders throughout Asia and Africa.

Even during World War II, when the Soviets were 'comrades in arms' with England, Soviet propagandists continued to damn England for her colonialism. It was sympathetic reaction to this Soviet propaganda which caused Roosevelt, at the outset of the war, to exert intense pressure on Churchill to give India independence. Those of us who shudder when reflecting on the immense quantities of American blood and treasure spent to help England in the twentieth century, should not forget that American political pressure helped strip England of her colonial empire following World War II.

Communists were particularly successful, in the postwar period, at fanning the flames of nationalism, urging Asians and Africans to "throw off the shackles" of colonialism. Even before we set up NATO in 1949, the Soviets pounded us (in the United Nations and through their other propaganda media) for supporting the colonial powers of Europe. It was sympathetic reaction to this Soviet propaganda which caused Truman to push the Netherlands until they abandoned their rich colonies in the East Indies and permitted the socialist, pro-communist "United States of Indonesia" to be formed as an independent nation. Those of us who grimace when we think about the one billion, 448 million, 813 thousand dollars of American tax money given the Netherlands (as of June 30, 1958) should remember Indonesia.

After we set up NATO in 1949, the intensified

Soviet propaganda about our support of European colonial powers in their "suppression of the dark races" was most painful to our internationalist 'liberals.' Their new foreign policy required that America buy the friendship of everyone, everywhere — but most particularly of "oppressed" and dark-skinned people. They could see that their foreign policy was working against itself: our support of NATO nations was causing people throughout Asia, Africa, and the Middle East to hate us. Did it ever occur to them to change the policy? Of course not! The thing to do was reach deeper into the pockets of American taxpayers so that the program of supporting the world could be broadened, deepened, and accelerated. This was done, year after year, as the frightful consequences of our foreign policy programs became more apparent.

Through the medium of our overseas propaganda agency (currently known as the United States Information Agency) we let the "colonial peoples" know that our sympathies were really with them, even though we were supporting the colonial powers in NATO. This caused the colonial powers, especially France, to resent us. France blames America more than she blames the Soviet Union for colonial unrest which has caused France great trouble since 1945. France has used this as justification for using American aid (intended for NATO purposes) in her colonial wars. The French use of American weapons and goods against Algerians and Tunisians has intensified Mohammedan hatred of America in the middle east.

Growing anti-Americanism in Africa and Asia (which our "defense of the free world" in Europe was feeding) sent our internationalist leaders in search of some means to "defend the free world" in Asia and Africa and the middle east. They set up SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) and METO (Middle East Treaty Organization) and they proclaimed the Eisenhower Doctrine — which was an unlimited invitation to all nations of the middle east to get on the American dole and call upon American military power to protect them whenever they pleased.

The results were even worse than in Europe.

IN TOTO

The Roosevelt-Truman-Eisenhower foreign policy has failed wretchedly in Latin America, as elsewhere. Never before has there been as much Latin American hatred of the United States as today. Never before has the military security of this nation been so endangered by the presence of enemy power and intrigue in the Caribbean area.

We have burdened our own citizens with taxes and sacrificed our vital national interests to 'help' Latin American nations. But our 'help' has encouraged, strengthened, and subsidized the native political instability and the alien communist subversion which spread misery below the border.

Always and everywhere, America, meddling in the affairs of other nations, trying to buy the goodwill of both sides in all disputes, incurs the contempt and enmity of everyone. Our foreign policy is so void of understandable principles, and good sense, that we cannot even be consistent in the foreign meddling which the policy requires. We were quick to intervene in South Korean internal affairs and stab poor old Syngman Rhee — a proven friend of America — with harsh official comment; but we were so reluctant to intervene in Cuban internal affairs, when communist Castro was coming to power, that we wouldn't even protect our own military personnel against Castro's hoodlums.

1953

The fatal absurdity of our post-war foreign policy became painfully apparent in the first year of Eisenhower's administration. Truman's hideous mess in Korea was one cause of the public revolt which put Eisenhower in office originally. Now that they were in the Korean war and had

lost over 50,000 men, Americans wanted the victory that was obviously obtainable — not only to vindicate their dead, but to accomplish the purpose for which Truman said he went to war: to throw the communists out of Korea; but in 1953, Eisenhower, without a struggle, handed victory to the communists: signed an armistice on their terms and from that day forward ignored their flagrant violations of their own armistice terms.

Why? If Eisenhower had done otherwise, he would have abandoned the foreign policy he inherited and believed in. The United Nations was officially declared to be the cornerstone of our foreign policy, which was built on Roosevelt's premise that "we cannot live alone." If we had won the Korean war in defiance of the United Nations, we would have been 'living alone' again. Eisenhower, a thorough-going internationalist, could not face up to that; nor would his foreign policy permit it.

In 1953, Stalin died, and rebellions began to occur in his slave empire. Surely, if all our national-defense and foreign-aid efforts were designed to fight communism (as we were told each year when appropriations had to be pushed through Congress) this was the time to exploit weaknesses in the Soviet system. Now was the time for breaking off diplomatic relations with the Soviets, to show their victims that we too regarded the Kremlin gang as gangsters. But such action would have violated the internationalist's thesis that communists must be treated with friendly tolerance; and it would have destroyed our policy of directing the affairs of this nation in compliance with the wishes of other nations.

Instead of rebuking the Soviets in 1953, Eisenhower offered food to soothe the rebels' rebellious spirits.

1956

There was seething unrest throughout the communist empire in the summer of 1956:

anti-communists in the Ukraine wrecked a communist troop train and seized arms and ammunition;

workers in Soviet Georgia staged a six-day demonstration against Kremlin policies: communist police and soldiers put down the Georgian rebellion by machine-gunning workers who were storming government buildings in Tiflis;

in the Soviet Baltic states — Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania — anti-Kremlin activities boiled: on one occasion, rebels seized a government radio station in Latvia and held it for two days before communist police could drive them out with guns and grenades;

in Czechoslovakia, communists used terror tactics to suppress a series of anti-Kremlin riots and demonstrations by students: an official radio station in Prague broadcast a warning that "anyone who raises his hand against the regime will have his hand chopped off";

news of open revolt in 16 provinces of red China leaked to the outside world in the summer of 1956;

in Tibet, bloody uprisings against communist tyrants spread through eight provinces after Chinese communists had used bombing planes to punish the rebellious inhabitants of one Tibetan city;

inspired by the brave efforts of their fellow sufferers elsewhere, anti-communists in East Germany made another abortive attempt to revolt;

in Poznan, Poland, June 29, 1956, Polish patriots revolted, demanding food and freedom; they held out three days against Russian soldiers who were using artillery, tanks, and machine guns; on the third day, weeping Polish women, standing in mournful silence, watched police wagons and army trucks carry away thousands of patriots.

The year 1956, even more than the year 1953, was a year of crisis for communist rulers. Their subjugated peoples were on the edge of total revolt, everywhere. If total revolt had come, it would

have blown the communist slave empire apart and destroyed the octopus whose evil tentacles reach around the world and whose centers of control are in the Kremlin. That kind of revolt would have occurred in 1956 if the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain had received positive signs of sympathy from the west.

The signs never came. America (leader and banker of the west in a prolonged worldwide effort which was called a 'struggle against communism') ignored most of the anti-communist rebellions of 1956. The Polish riots in Poznan were too severe (and had been witnessed by too many foreigners) to ignore; so, our President reacted exactly as he had done three years before with regard to anti-communist rebellions in East Germany: he offered the communist government of Poland free food for distribution to the rebels who were demanding food.

In October, 1956, there was another rebellion in Poland. This one, however, was not an uprising of patriots. It appeared to be a Kremlin-planned affair to make the west think the communist government of Poland was independent of the Soviet Union.

Our President offered more aid to the 'new' communist government of Poland and said that "our hearts go out" to the Polish people.

On October 21, 1956, students in Budapest, Hungary, precipitated a rebellion against Hungary's communist tyrants. Soviet soldiers (using tanks, machine guns and heavy artillery) mowed down unarmed Hungarians — men, women, and children. After 12 days of savage fighting, Khrushchev broke the back of the Hungarian revolt with a typical maneuver. Pretending that he was ready to withdraw Russian troops from Hungary, Khrushchev lured Hungarian leaders into peace talks. On November 4, 1956, while the peace talks were in session, powerful Soviet forces launched a general attack on the whole nation of Hungary.

President Eisenhower offered relief supplies to the communist government of Hungary for distribution to the people, while assuring the world that 'our hearts go out to the Hungarian people';

and he put heavy pressure on West Germany and Spain to keep Hungarian patriots from getting outside help.

Why? For the same reason that he offered help to other communist governments when rebellions occurred: to keep local rebellions from exploding into general war. With the foreign policy he had, and believed in, our President could do little else. Our 'sturdy free-world partners in the defense of freedom' would not have approved any American action to encourage total rebellion against the Soviets. With our foreign policy, we cannot defy the wishes of our 'friends.'

In many cases, however, our foreign policy reaches a dead-end of frustration, because we have 'friends' on both sides of a quarrel. Our internationalists have found only one way out of such dilemmas: more American aid to all parties involved, the theory being, apparently, that if quarreling nations can get more from American taxpayers than they expected to get by fighting each other, they will stop fighting.

This theory of our internationalist foreign policy experts was tested in Egypt, during the fall of 1956.

On October 23 and 24, 1956, Israel, France, and England — in defiance of American wishes, and without the courtesy of notifying us — invaded Egypt. Four of our "free world" allies were at war among themselves, and our presidential election was less than two weeks away!

After our elections, Eisenhower asked France, England, and Israel to get out of Egypt; and he reached into the pockets of American taxpayers for the cost of that little war: a 500 million dollar loan to Britain; 'forgiving' an eighty-three million dollar interest payment due from Britain on previous loans; and a promise of oil and other aid to all of Europe to keep our friends from suffering the consequences of their own deeds.

As soon as he was inaugurated for his second term, in January, 1957, Eisenhower, who had created an election stampede for himself by prom-

ising no involvement in the Suez conflict, proclaimed the Eisenhower Doctrine, designed to involve America militarily and economically in every conflict in the whole middle east.

1958

On January 11, 1958, the White House announced that Eric A. Johnston had been given the job of arranging a White House Conference, to be attended by about 700 leaders in all fields of American life who would organize and stimulate public support for the administration's foreign policy programs — particularly foreign aid.

On January 28, 1958, Ted Lewis, in his column, "Capital Circus," in the New York *Daily News*, said:

"In the last 24 hours the White House has given its blessing to a big privately financed grass roots campaign aimed at putting public pressure on a reluctant Congress to okay President Eisenhower's \$3.9 billion foreign aid program There will be two privately financed organizations, each so contrived that contributions . . . will get tax breaks.

"This idea of a tax break for citizens supporting the Administration's controversial foreign aid policies is novel and obviously an inducement to a lot of people who favor the pouring of taxpayers' money abroad"

In January, 1958, France obtained a 655 million dollar emergency loan from the United States, Western Germany, and international agencies (most of the money coming, of course, from American taxpayers, whether directly or indirectly).

In April, 1958, communists helped overthrow the 24th French government since World War II. The event was seasoned with angry jibes, from all factions, at the United States. One leading French "rightist" suggested that the Soviet Union would probably be a better ally for France than

America has been (American *postwar* aid to France, through June 30, 1958, totaled 6 billion, 633 million, 427 thousand dollars).

Without a government and on the edge of civil war, France, as a reliable American ally, was obviously gone; and with France (the 'keystone' of our NATO defenses) gone, America's fantastically expensive "free world" defenses were also gone.

Commenting on the "defense situation" generally in April, 1958, Neil H. McElroy, American Secretary of Defense, said:

"Certainly, our NATO allies know that, without the protection of the very major-sized deterrent force of this country, the NATO countries would be in a bad way to defend themselves against a power of anything like the capability of Russia, especially if we were knocked out. I think they would be the first to say that the keystone of the force that deters Russia is right here — sits right on this continent."

Prior to this remark by Mr. McElroy in April, 1958, every official American comment concerning the 'keystone' of NATO's deterrent force against Russia, spoke of France as the 'keystone.' Mr. McElroy's statement clearly means that, with regard to opposing Russia, it doesn't much matter what happens to the NATO thing, because the only effective opposition to Soviet military power is in *America* — the American military force that "sits right on this continent."

Knowing this, why have our leaders set the bulk, and the best, of our army strength in Europe where it could do nothing but die or surrender and become a helpless hostage, if the Soviets should attack?

Defense Secretary McElroy said:

"We have the confidence (in our NATO allies) that stems from long years of association with these allies. They, I suppose, may have some doubts about us. We have seen some expressed by news commentators of our NATO allies. They raise the question of whether the United States

really means that it is willing to jeopardize this country in response to an attack possibly made in the future against one of our NATO allies."

We have fought their wars and fed their people and built their industries. We have piled up our national debt in order to reduce their national debts. We have inflated our currency in our efforts to stabilize theirs. We have confidence in them, but they still have doubts about us. So we send our biggest, best Army as a helpless, useless hostage, to prove our good faith.

This is an accurate statement of conditions; and the conditions are an inevitable consequence of our foreign policy.

If a wealthy citizen in your town started going through the community making lavish gifts to everyone who would accept, what would people think of him? They would take his money, but consider him a fool. Their contempt would be mixed with suspicion. If he insisted that he had no selfish motives, their contempt and suspicion would deepen. If he admitted that he might, some day, expect return favors, they who were taking his money would be uneasy, lest he had already tricked them into something dangerous or unsavory. Many might feel sorry for him; and, as long as he was handing out money, most would fawn on him at the proper times; but his giving would make him more enemies than friends. Folks who were taking his money would start comparing amounts with others. Those getting less than someone else would feel angry and jealous, because they were getting so little in comparison.

These are precisely the attitudes which our foreign policy programs (particularly foreign aid) have created in the world community of nations. This is the situation obliquely described in statements (quoted above) made by America's Secretary of Defense in the latter part of April, 1958.

On May 6, 1958, President Eisenhower, asking Republicans in Congress to support his requests for foreign aid, said:

"No nation, not even the United States, can isolate itself from its friends and be secure. There is the whole case for Mutual Security Under this program we have forged a free world shield against communist force

"These programs augment our own security They give to all these countries a hope, a sense of achievement, a rising living standard that makes them our sturdy partners in defense of freedom."

Next day — May 7, 1958 — *The New York Times* published a special dispatch from correspondent Thomas P. Brady in Morocco. Mr. Brady, having interviewed leaders of the Algerian rebellion against France, said that anti-American feeling is growing among rank-and-file Algerians — primarily because of American economic and military aid to France.

Next day — May 8, 1958 — an anti-American mob in Lima, Peru, pelted the Vice President of the United States with rocks and garbage and spat in his face.

On May 10, 1958, a mob broke into the United States Information Agency Library at Tripoli, Lebanon, and destroyed it.

On May 12, 1958, a mob smashed through a police guard outside a United States Information Agency Library in Beirut, Lebanon. The rioters threw books and furniture into the street and burned them — then set fire to the interior of the library.

On May 13, 1958, President Eisenhower met with Republican Congressional leaders again. Joseph Martin, one of the leaders said:

"The President made it very clear that he already shudders at the idea of any further cuts (in foreign aid). He shudders to think how he could meet the world situation if there are any further cuts."

At about the same hour on May 13, when President Eisenhower was shuddering in Washington, Vice President Nixon was shuddering in Venezuela. An anti-American mob of 3000 people, shak-

ing their fists and screaming, "Go home, Yankee Dog," pounded Nixon's car with rocks and garbage, and ripped off the American flag. Nixon, covered with spit, sought safety in the American embassy. One man had spat in Mrs. Nixon's face.

On that same day — May 13, 1958 — a mob of 50,000 Frenchmen in Algiers broke into the United States Information Agency office, shoved an American State Department employee aside, and sacked the place — then marched past the American consulate's office, jeering and threatening.

Same day — May 13 — mobs tried to bomb the U. S. Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. They stoned a bus carrying Americans to the airport, and stoned a downtown hotel occupied by American tourists.

On May 15, 1958 — while the United States was rushing weapons to the Lebanese government, helping it maintain itself in power — the Lebanese government announced that it would accept no further American aid, unless it were offered as a carte-blanche gift, with no terms imposed, as to use or anything else.

On May 20, 1958, the American Secretary of State, defending his foreign policy at a press conference, said:

"I do not believe that there is anything basically different that we can do."

In June, 1958, Castro's communist rebels in Cuba kidnapped 29 American sailors and held them as hostages in the Cuban hills for almost six weeks. Our government didn't rebuke Castro, but did plead and wheedle with him.

On July 14, 1958, a pro-Egyptian military junta overthrew the government of Iraq, putting control of this nation in the hands of men friendly toward communism, hostile toward America. Iraq (America's closest, strongest, and richest friend in the middle east) was the keystone of our whole middle eastern policy. Key members of Congress and political analysts everywhere agreed that,

"the bloody rebellion in Iraq had brought America's middle east policy crashing down about its ears."

Lebanon (another "pro-western" middle east nation) was in the 67th day of a rebellion directed by anti American pro-Egyptian forces; and the Iraq rebellion spread into Jordan — America's only remaining "friend" among the Arab countries.

On July 15, 1958, 5,000 U. S. Marines landed in Lebanon, "to assist the government of Lebanon to preserve its territorial integrity and political independence," pending election of a new President to succeed President Camille Chamoun (considered friendly toward the United States). The Lebanese presidential candidate whom the American State Department supported, while our troops occupied Lebanon, was Fouad Chehab — the candidate whom Nasser of Egypt had first suggested. As soon as Fouad Chehab was elected president of Lebanon, he appointed Rashid Karami as Prime Minister and Minister of Defense. All this accomplished, Eisenhower withdrew American troops from Lebanon.

Rashid Karami, whom we helped install as Prime Minister and Defense Minister of Lebanon, is a well-known communist who had helped lead the rebellion which Eisenhower had sent U. S. Marines to protect Lebanon against in the first place.

The government of West Germany said some harsh things about President Eisenhower's sending troops to Lebanon. When told about this, President Eisenhower said:

"Is this what we get for giving Germany \$7.5 billion of aid since the war?"

The obvious answer is *yes*.

PART III

Next week this review of foreign policy will conclude with positive recommendations for 1960 and beyond.